EXPERT CRITICIZED

Errors Charged in Kennedy Gun Probe

BY DAVE SMITH

Criminalist DeWayne A. Wolfer was charged Fri-day with errors and violations of procedure in the ballistics investigations of the Sen. Robert F. Kennedy assassination, the Jack Kirschke murder case and the Doyle A. Terry mur-

The charge was made by attorney Barbara Warner Blehr in an effort to block Wolfer's appointment as permanent head of the Los

permanent head of the Los Angeles Police Department crime laboratory.

Mrs. Blehr's charges raise the question of whether a second gunman might bave fired shots in the Ambassador Hotel pantry on June 5, 1968, and then escaped unnoticed as Sirhan Bishara Sirhan was tackled by Sirhan was tackled by friends of the mortally wounded senator.

Test Firing of Gun

Test Firing of Gun
In a four-page letter to
the Civil Service Commission, Mrs. Blehraccused
Wolfer of violating four
separate precepts of investigative procedure in the
Kennedy investigation
and alleges that Wolfer,
never actually fired the
gun wrested from Sirhan's
grip. She asserts that Wolgrip. She asserts that Wolfer test-fired a different gun entirely, and that this gun, in fact, did match at least three builtes removed from victims of the

Wolfer, asked by The Times for his reaction, said, "I honestly can't understand this. I'll swear on a stack of Bibles I've done a stack of Bibles I've done nothing wrong and I'll stand behind my work in a court of law. I can't say any more until I've read the charges against me, but I'm going to get an attorney right away."
Chief Dep. Dist. Atty. John Howard said his office would review the Sirhan trial transcript and

han trial transcript and the ballistics investigation before making any com-

ment.
With her letter to the Civil Service Commission, Mrs. Blehr sent six photo-grapbs and three affida-vits, signed by crimina-lists LeMoyne Snyder, Raymond H. Pinker and Walter Jack Cadman, sup-

porting her contentions.

Two of the photographs are of exhibit 55 from the are of exhibit 55 from the Sirhan trial. That is an envelope containing three bullets purportedly fired from Sirhan's gun, but also bearing, in Wolfer's handwriting, the notation that Sirhan's gun bore the serial No. H18602. According to trial records, the gun taken from Sirhan bore the serial number H53725.

The test shots were made on June 6, 1968, and third photograph is of

made on June 6, 1968, and a third photograph is of a message from the Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation in Sacramento, noting that gun number H18602—the one identified in testimony as the gun used in the ballistics tests—was destroyed tics tests-was destroyed by the LAPD sometime in July, 1968, only a month after the murder of Ken-

nedy.
"The only possible conclusion that must be reached is that two similar than the possible conclusion fired at reacted is to at two similarguns were being fired at
the scene of the crime,"
Mrs. Blehr said. "Such a
conclusion then leads unavoidably to the question:
Which of the two guns
fired the single fatal bullet?"
The investigation upon

The investigation upon which Mrs. Blehr's charges were founded was done by criminalist Wil-liam W. Harper of Pasade-

na. Harper, 69, has testified in numerous trials in Los Angeles over the last three decades, including the Kirschke trial, in which his testimony contradicted that of Wolfer. Harper contended that Kirschke could not have murdered his wife and her lever. his wife and her lover.

Terry was convicted of the slaying of Long Beach police officer Vernon J. Owings in 1960.

Alterations Alleged

Mrs. Blehr's letter ac-cuses Wolfer in one case —not the Kennedy investi-gation — of "scurrilous tampering—in a vain at-tempt to make the physi-cal evidence support the cal evidence support the prosecution's theory of the murder—" charging that he "made physical alterations of certain inscriptions on three rifle cartridge cases..."

Regarding the alleged errors in the Kennedy investigation, Mrs. Blehr states: "I find it very hard to believe that a man of

to believe that a man of the professed expertise of Mr. Wolfer could violate four of the basic precepts of his profession in a single case by sheer acci-dent. I am more inclined to believe that these violations were made in re-sponce to an overzealous desire to help the cause of the prosecution. The choice seems to be rank incompetence on the one hand or morbid motiva-tion on the other."